| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/057,249 | 01/25/2002 | Senthil Prabakaran | 12849-002001 | 2769 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 21005    7590    05/17/2005 | EXAMINER | |
| HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C. | LE, DEBBIE M | |
| 530 VIRGINIA ROAD | | |
| P.O. BOX 9133 | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| CONCORD, MA 01742-9133 | 2167 | |

DATE MAILED: 05/17/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| **Office Action Summary** | 10/057,249 | PRABAKARAN ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | DEBBIE M. LE | 2167 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *13 December 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.  2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-10,14-17,19,20,22 and 23* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-10,14-17,19,20,22 and 23* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All  b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Amendment*

Applicants' arguments filed on 12/13/04. Claims 11-13, 18 and 21 have been

canceled. Claims 1-10, 14-17, 19-20 and 22-23 are pending for examinations.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the
United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application
by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this
title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act

of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical

Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting

directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000.

Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior

to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 1-10, 14,17, 19, 20, 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by Hind et al (USP 6,585,778 B1).

As per claim 1, Hind discloses a method comprising:

providing a network (fig. 1, communication channel # 32), the network having a

first system (fig. 1, # 10, workstation);

generating a request of a policy from the first system (as a user requested

information, data policy col. 11, lines 9-10 at a client 10 of Fig. 2) to a second system

(data source, or server, (col. 1, lines 15-21, col. 7, lines 6-8);

retrieving the policy for the first system in the second system (fig. 5-6, col. 13,

lines 1-56); and

providing the policy to the first system (XML document which restricts the values

that will be displayed to the requesting user, col. 11, lines 16-17).

As per claim 2, Hind teaches a third system for determining the policy the first

system should receive (publishing company, col. 3, lines 37-48, col. 4, lines 38-42, 50-

59, col. 11, lines 18-35).

As per claim 3, Hind teaches the second system designates parameters of the

policy (col. 9, lines 52-53).

As per claim 4, Hind teaches a third system for receiving the policy from the

second system (col. 9, lines 20-50).

As per claim 5, Hind teaches wherein the first system is a policy enabled node

(figs 1-2, col. 8, lines 60-67).

As per claim 6, Hind teaches wherein the policy enabled node is enabled by a

node proxy  (col. 3, lines 40-45).

As per claim 7, Hind teaches wherein policy parameters are unique to the

request (col. 9, lines 50-67).

As per claim 8, Hind teaches wherein the policy enabled node is a computer (Fig. 3)

As per claim 9, Hind teaches wherein the policy enabled node is a software application (application programming code, or server application, col. 7, lines 20-50).

As per claim 10, Hind teaches wherein a provider facilitates transfer of the policy from a data source (distributed network computing, col. 3, lines 61-62).

Claim 14 is rejected by the same rationale as state in independent claim 1 argument.

As per claims 17, 19, Hind teaches a policy parameter wherein the policy parameter calls for each object (fig. 3, col. 8, lines 63-65, col. 9, lines 36-64).

As per claims 20, 22, Hind teaches wherein the first system uses Extensible Markup Language (XML), Directory Services Markup Language (DSML), or Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP) (col. 4, lines 36-37).

As per claim 23, Hind discloses a method for implementing policies for the administration of nodes (server) connected to a network(wireless network, internet) having at least, a single node or plurality of nodes to be policy enabled (fig. 2, # 10), one or more policy managers that determine the specific policy the node(s) should receive (server, col. 3, lines 37-48, col. 4, lines 38-42, 50-59, col. 11, lines 18-35), and one or more data sources for the storage of policies data source, or server (col. 1, lines 15-21, col. 7, lines 6-8), said method comprising the steps of:

providing for the request of a policy from the node or node proxy to the policy

manager (as a user requested information, data policy (col. 11, lines 9-10), with the

specific policy parameters for the particular node making the request (col. 3, lines 5-12);

providing for the determination of the particular provider needed to facilitate

transfer of the requested policy from the data source (fig. 5-6, col. 13, lines 1-56);

providing for the transfer of a resultant list of policies from the particular data

source based on the policy parameters (col. 11, lines 45-62);

providing for the modification of the list of policies in accordance with a dynamic

set of policy rules (flexible, dynamically, col. 8, lines 59-67);

providing for the retrieval of the policy settings associated with the policies in the

modified list (col. 14, lines 10-26);

providing for the transfer of the policy attributes to the particular node making the

request (col. 10, lines 32-52); and

providing for the implementation of the policy attributes on the particular node

making the request (data policy which restricts the values that will be displayed to the

requesting user, col. 11, lines 16-17).

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hind et al (USP 6,585,778 B1) in view of Helgeson et al (USP 6, 643,652).

As per claims 15-16, Hind teaches intermediaries commonly apply various types translations and/or transformations based upon target text (col. 7, lines 25-45). Hind does not explicitly teach having the same and a different operating system for the first system and the second system. However, Helgeson teaches the first and the second have the same and/or different operating systems (col. 1, lines 53-67, col. 11, lines 27-62). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited of references to implement the first and second with the same or different operating systems because it would provide user efficient to import/export/exchange data among different operating systems based upon a user's target text.

### *Response to Arguments*

Applicant's arguments filed 12/13/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants' argued that Hind et al ('778) does not providing the policy to the first system, or policy content is sent to the first system.

In response, examiner respectfully submits that Hind teaches "enforcing data policy in a distributed network computing environment using style sheet" (see col. 7, lines 20-21). "The style sheet is a specification of a style that is to be used when presenting a document" (see col. 7, lines 65-66). An XML is one type of documents (see col. 8, lines 2-4). Document Type Definition (hereafter 'DTD') has been augmented with one or more references to one or more stored policy enforcement objects (col. 18-23) and an XML is an output document which policy enforcement objects stored therein and the policy enforcement objects are delivered (distributed) to a client from a server (col. 3, lines 62-63, col. 4, lines 35-38). As seen, the DTD for the XML document includes a specification of URIs of each applicable policy (col. 9, lines 1-5). As the result, there is no added network overhead between the client and server once URI references stored policy. The stored policy can then be retrieved, for example, URI that may be used to retrieve the unrestricted policy information (col. 10, lines 21-31, col. 9, lines 40-52). Thus, Hind does teach the claim limitations providing the policy to the first system, or policy content is sent to the first system based upon the above passages.

## *Conclusion*

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to DEBBIE M. LE whose telephone number is (571) 272-

4111. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, JOHN BREENE can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DEBBIE M LE
Examiner
Art Unit 2167

Debbie Le

May 13, 2005.

MOHAMMAD ALI
PRIMARY EXAMINER